

PEARSON, SIMON, WARSHAW & PENNY, LLP
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2450
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)
bsimon@pswplaw.com
GEORGE S. TREVOR (Bar No. 127875)
gtrevor@pswplaw.com
WILLIAM J. NEWSOM (Bar No. 267643)
wnewsom@pswplaw.com
PEARSON, SIMON, WARSHAW & PENNY, LLP
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 433-9000
Facsimile: (415) 433-9008

Attorneys for Defendants California Assignments
LLC and Development Specialists, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

AMERICAN SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., an
Idaho corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CALIFORNIA ASSIGNMENTS LLC, a
California limited liability company;
DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS, INC., an
Illinois corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,;

Defendants.

CASE NO. 12-CV-6138

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXTENDING TIME FOR
DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND TO
MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

Hon. Lucy Koh

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, American Semiconductor, Inc. ("Plaintiff") and California Assignments LLC and Development Specialists, Inc. (together, "Defendants"), by and through counsel, hereby stipulate and jointly move the Court to extend the time for Defendants to file their response to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 30) by one week, from March 8 to March 15, 2013.

(1) This request for an extension is being sought in order to afford Defendants' attorneys additional time to consult with their clients and to provide time to adequately address all issues raised in Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. The request is not being made

1 for purposes of delay.

2 (2) The parties previously stipulated to and requested that (a) the motion for
3 preliminary injunction be heard at an earlier date than the originally scheduled April 18, 2013, and
4 (b) Defendants be given until January 24, 2013 to respond to the Complaint. Dkt. No. 19. The
5 motion to shorten time was denied due to the Court's schedule, but Defendants' request to extend
6 the time to respond to the Complaint was granted. Dkt. No. 20.

7 (3) Defendants moved to dismiss the instant case on January 24, 2013. Dkt. No. 22.
8 Defendants scheduled the motion hearing for the earliest available date, May 30, 2013.

9 (4) Subsequently, the parties stipulated to an extension of time to allow Plaintiff an
10 additional two weeks to respond to the Motion to Dismiss, from February 7 to February 21, 2013.
11 Dkt. No. 23. The Court granted that stipulation. Dkt. No. 24.

12 (5) The parties further stipulated to grant an additional single day extension for
13 Plaintiff to file its response to the motion to dismiss on February 22, instead of February 21, 2013.
14 Dkt. No. 28.

15 (6) On February 22, Plaintiff filed its Response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Dkt.
16 No. 29), and a Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 30).

17 (7) The present request would extend Defendants' time to respond to that Motion for
18 Partial Summary Judgment by a week, from March 8 to March 15.

19 (8) Because the hearing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, and on Plaintiff's Motion
20 for Partial Summary Judgment, is scheduled for May 30, 2013, more than two months away, the
21 proposed extension of time should have no effect on the schedule of this case.

22

23 DATED: March 8, 2013

24 **PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER**
25 **LLP**

26 /s/ J. Thomas Beckett
27 *By: J. Thomas Beckett*
Counsel for Plaintiff

PEARSON, SIMON WARSHAW & PENNY,

/s/ William Newsom
By: William Newsom
Counsel for Defendants

28

ATTESTATION

By his electronic signature above, counsel for the Defendants attests that he is the ECF user whose identification and password are being used to file the instant document, and that pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), all counsel whose electronic signatures appear above provided their authority and concurrence to file this document.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: March 12, 2013



Hon. Lucy Koh
United States District Judge